



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,088	10/24/2003	Mark G. Fontenot	4012.13	8477
23308	7590	07/16/2007		
PETERS VERNY, L.L.P. 425 SHERMAN AVENUE SUITE 230 PALO ALTO, CA 94306			EXAMINER ROBERTS, LEZAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed April 5, 2007. All previous rejections have been withdrawn unless stated below.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claims recite (e) in the fifth line. "(e)" should read "(d)" to correspond with (d) as cited in originally in claim 16. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 – Anticipation (Previous Rejection)

1) Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sagel et al. (US 2001/0053375). This rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues the compositions of the reference are combined and not kept separate until applied to the tooth as in the instant invention. The reference teaches away from the instant invention. This argument is not persuasive.

The claims recite a first composition with a means of applying the composition to the teeth. The claims do not disclose other separate compositions just a first composition, which may be a one-part composition. The reference discloses a

Art Unit: 1614

composition on a strip, which is a means for applying the solution to the surface of the teeth. Therefore the reference encompasses the instant claims.

2) Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Ambuter et al. (US 5,997,764). This rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues there is not suggestion or teaching to keep the components of these reactive compositions separate until they are applied to the teeth. The reference teaches away from the instant invention. This argument is not persuasive.

The claims do not recite the limitation that the composition includes separate solutions. The claims read on a composition comprising hypochlorite and flavoring. Therefore there is no limitation in the claims to keep the two components separate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 – Obviousness (Previous Rejections)

1) Claims 1-6 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howes (US 2002/0098246). The rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues the reference does not teach or suggest whitening of teeth. It does not teach or suggest the importance of keeping the components separate before applying them to the teeth or that the components together work better than the components individually. Howes does not even reach the “obvious-to-try” standard and would instead lead one of skill in the art away from the present invention not toward it. The argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1614

Howes discloses two part compositions. The fact that the components are separated suggests the components need to be separated before use. In regards to intended use, the intended use of the compositions carries no weight in determining patentability because the compositions of the reference are substantially the same, comprising two separate solutions one comprising sodium hypochlorite and the other comprising hydrogen peroxide that may be used orally, as the compositions of the instant claims. Therefore the compositions of the reference may be used to whiten teeth since the compositions of the reference and the compositions of the instant claims are substantially the same.

2) Claims 1-4, 6 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van den Bosch (US 6,017,515). The rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues the reference does not teach or suggest the importance of keeping the reactive components separate until they are applied. It does not teach or suggest the importance of keeping the components separate before applying them to the teeth or that the components together work better than the components individually. Van den Bosch does not even reach the "obvious-to-try" standard and would instead lead one of skill in the art away from the present invention not toward it. The argument is not persuasive.

See Examiner's response above in the Obviousness section subsection 1.

Art Unit: 1614

3) Claims 1-6, 14-17 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung (US 2006/0060819).

Applicant argues the reference does not teach or suggest the importance of keeping the reactive components separate until they are applied. It does not teach or suggest the present invention. Jung does not even reach the "obvious-to-try" standard and would instead lead one of skill in the art away from the present invention not toward it. The argument is not persuasive.

The reference discloses the two compositions are separated before use. The peroxide is activated by the hypochlorite, therefore the hypochlorite is incorporated into a separate composition. The importance of keeping the two components separate is so that they won't react before use, this is the reason they are stored separately. Furthermore Applicant is claiming a composition and does not recite the importance of separating the compositions. The limitation is the components are two different solutions, which is encompassed by the reference. As for teaching away, the reference is not teaching away because it discloses a two component system where one component comprises a peroxide and the other component comprise hypochlorite, which encompasses the instant invention.

Claims 1-6, 14-18 and 21-22 are rejected.

Claims 7-13 and 19-20 are withdrawn.

No claims allowed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lezah W. Roberts whose telephone number is 571-272-1071. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lezah Roberts
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1614



Frederick Krass
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

